

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 MARCUS ROBINSON,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., AZTEC  
15 FORECLOSURE CORPORATION, PHH  
16 MORTGAGE CORPORATION, ROBERT  
E. WEISS INCORPORATED, DOES 1  
THROUGH 100,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 12-cv-983-MMA (NLS)

**ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
DISMISS**

[Doc. No. 18]

17  
18 Currently before the Court is Defendants' Bank of America, N.A. and PHH Mortgage  
19 Corporation's motion to dismiss Plaintiff Marcus Robinson's complaint in the above-captioned  
20 foreclosure action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). [Doc. No. 18.] The  
21 motion is unopposed. For the reasons set forth below, the Court **GRANTS** the motion and  
22 **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice.

23 **I. BACKGROUND**

24 This action arises from events surrounding the foreclosure proceedings against Plaintiff's  
25 property, located at 2628 Secret Lake Lane, Fallbrook, CA 92028. On April 20, 2012, Plaintiff  
26 Marcus Robinson, proceeding *pro se*, filed this foreclosure action against Defendants Bank of  
27 America, N.A. ("BOA"), Aztec Foreclosure Corporation ("Aztec"), PHH Mortgage Corporation  
28 ("PHH"), and Robert E. Weiss Incorporated ("Weiss"). [Doc. No. 1.] On May 8, 2012, Defendant

1 Aztec filed a Declaration of Non-Monetary Status [Doc. No. 6]; on July 25, 2012, the Court *sua*  
 2 *sponte* dismissed all claims against Defendant Weiss [Doc. No. 17]. On August 7, 2012,  
 3 Defendants BOA and PHH filed the pending motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint. [Doc. No.  
 4 18.] Defendants contend that Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a viable claim for relief.

5 Approximately eight weeks have passed and Plaintiff has failed to file an opposition.  
 6 Thus, Defendants' motion to dismiss is unopposed.

## 7 II. DISCUSSION

8 A district court may properly grant an unopposed motion to dismiss pursuant to a local rule  
 9 where the local rule permits, but does not require, the granting of a motion for failure to respond.  
 10 *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995). Southern District of California Civil Local  
 11 Rule 7.1 provides: "If an opposing party fails to file the papers in the manner required by Civil  
 12 Local Rule 7.1(e)(2), that failure may constitute a consent to the granting of a motion or other  
 13 request for ruling by the court." S.D. Cal. Civ. L. R. 7.1(f)(3)(a). "Although there is . . . a [public]  
 14 policy favoring disposition on the merits, it is the responsibility of the moving party to move  
 15 towards that disposition at a reasonable pace, and to refrain from dilatory and evasive tactics." *In*  
 16 *re Eisen*, 31 F.3d 1447, 1454 (9th Cir. 1994) (affirming grant of motion to dismiss for failure to  
 17 prosecute); *see also Dipp v. BAC Home Loans Servicing, LP*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75696 (S.D.  
 18 Cal. May 31, 2012) (Battaglia, J.) (dismissing action pursuant to local Rule 7.1 for plaintiff's  
 19 failure to respond to a motion to dismiss); *Yueh Chen v. PMC Bancorp*, No. 09-CV-2405-WQH  
 20 (BLM), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75468 (S.D. Cal. July 23, 2010) (Hayes, J.) (same); *Steel v. City of*  
 21 *San Diego*, No. 09-CV-1743-MMA (WVG), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103042 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5,  
 22 2009) (Anello, J.) (same).

23 The docket reflects that Plaintiff was properly served by mail with the motion to dismiss on  
 24 August 7, 2012. [Doc. No. 18-2, p. 2 of 4.] The motion was originally noticed for hearing on  
 25 October 9, but was later rescheduled to October 15. Civil Local Rule 7.1 provides: "each party  
 26 opposing a motion . . . must file that opposition . . . with the clerk . . . not later than fourteen (14)  
 27 calendar days prior to the noticed hearing." S.D. Cal. Civ. L. R. 7.1(e)(2). Thus, the opposition to  
 28 Defendants' motion was due October 1. Plaintiff, however, failed to file an opposition despite

1 having a span of approximately 8 weeks between the motion notice and the hearing date. Further,  
2 to date, Plaintiff has not sought leave of the Court to file an untimely opposition. The Court  
3 concludes that “the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation,” “the court’s need to  
4 manage its docket,” and “the risk of prejudice to the defendants” weigh in favor of granting the  
5 motion to dismiss based on Plaintiff’s failure to file a timely opposition. *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53;  
6 *see also Dipp*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 756696, at \*3-5.

7  
8 **III. CONCLUSION**

9 Based on the foregoing, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion and **DISMISSES**  
10 Plaintiff’s complaint without prejudice. The Clerk of Court is instructed to terminate the case.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 DATED: October 16, 2012



13 Hon. Michael M. Anello  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28